



The Reflector

"We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" • Acts 4:20

Volume 29 • Number 8

August • 1989

Abortion On Demand—Another Name For Murder!

by Ron Halbrook

In all America's wars, from the Revolution to Viet Nam, she has lost 1,205,291 lives. About 1,500,000 babies are slaughtered in America every year! In 8 years (1939-46) Nazi Germany eliminated 6 million Jews but Americans eliminate 12 million babies every 8 years. The atom bomb killed 115,000 Japanese in Hiroshima and abortion kills 125,000 babies every month in America. One young pregnant woman said, "In this society we save whales, we save timber wolves and bald eagles and Coke bottles. Yet, everyone wanted me to throw away my baby" (Ronald Reagan, *Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation*, p. 35).

Abortion on demand gives a mother the "freedom of choice" to terminate her baby's "right to life." It is called "the termination of a pregnancy" in an effort to sound sophisticated and to soothe the conscience, but a miscarriage or a live birth is also the termination of a pregnancy. So, what is the difference? Abortion terminates a pregnancy by *exterminating a life!* The killing of an innocent, defenseless human being is murder. "Just because he is small, just because he cannot speak for himself, this is no excuse to regard him as expendable, anymore than we would do so on account of race or creed or color or pover-

ty" (Dr. R.B. Zachary, *ibid.*, p. 51). Since the child is in the protective care of his mother's womb, her sin in demanding his death is compounded and aggravated.

The spirit or inner man is made in the image of God, whether the body or outer man be male or female (Gen. 1:27). To take human life by shedding innocent blood violates the bonds of humanity and offends the Giver of life, as can be seen in the first murder when Cain killed Abel (Gen. 3). God is "the Father of spirits" and we must answer to Him for taking an innocent life (Heb. 12:9). God's law to the Jewish nation forbade murder: "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex. 20:13). Christ taught the same respect for life and explained through the apostle Paul:

... and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:9-10; cf. Matt. 22:34-40).

We must answer to God for the sin of murder by abortion because it violates the principles of love for God and for our fellow human beings who reflect the image of God.

Jesus said that those who despise their fellowmen and regard them as worthless fools "shall be in danger of hell fire" (Matt. 5:21-22). To curse one another with vile a filthy language is to regard

human life as cheap and expendable. All forms of murder, including abortion, put that same disregard for life into practice. Doctors who will poison unborn babies with a saline solution or hack their bodies to pieces to extract them from a mother's womb will also choke, smother, or even experiment with aborted babies who refuse to die. *This is already happening!* Next comes euthanasia or so-called "mercy killing" of people with incurable diseases, then starving babies with severe handicaps, and finally eliminating all sorts of groups of people who do not meet the nebulous criteria of "quality life"—groups like the chronically ill, the aged and infirm, mentally and physically handicapped people of all ages, social misfits, ne'er-do-wells, certain racial groups, immigrants, and what next?

Yes, abortion on demand is the immoral disregard for human life—just another name for murder! But the so-called "pro-choice" movement is trying desperately to defend the practice and to label its opponents as illogical, irrational, outdated fanatics. The implication is that those who favor killing unborn babies are up-to-date, rational, and logical. Can abortion be defended successfully by evidence and argument?

Abortion On Demand— Can It Be Defended?

Several arguments are made in an effort to justify abortion on

Continued on Page 3

Editorial:

Will Matthew 19:9 Fit Into Romans 14?

The Divorce-Remarriage issue has heated up a bit in recent months, especially since it has been widely publicized that a well-known, well-respected and well-liked brother is among those that teach that Matthew 19:9 does not apply to non-Christians. Hence, one may have been divorced (for any reason) and remarried any number of times before becoming a Christian and upon becoming a Christian remain in the marriage he happens to be in at the time—because Matthew 19:9 did not apply to him in his days of alienation. This idea has been around for some time now in rather isolated instances, but has not received such wide-spread attention among “conservative” brethren until rather recently. It has left some brethren wondering out loud what to do about it.

Of course, those who agree with the position have little problem with what to do about it. Just leave them alone and let them freely teach and/or practice it without interference from those who disagree with their doctrine. It is among those who disagree with the doctrine that the problem comes.

One solution, that has been given rather wide-spread editorial attention, is to make it parallel to the things mentioned in Romans 14—things which we are to “let each be fully convinced in his own mind” (v. 5), with each practicing his personal convictions, without either judging or setting at naught the other (v. 3). We are told, and we agree, that there are areas where brethren have practiced this principle over the years—the covering, military service, etc. In each case the things involve the individ-

ual and his conscience before God and not the collective action of the church. We are urged to treat the problems surrounding Matthew 19:9 in the same fashion. Judging from some of the published amen-type responses to the editorializing, the idea may be getting rather wide support even among those who say they do not agree with the position.

Nearly all of us agree that sincere brethren may study passages and reach different conclusions without it having to become an “issue” among brethren. While one may be rather confident that his conclusion is correct, and be conscientiously forced to personally live by that conclusion and even share his conclusion with others under proper circumstances, he recognizes the possibility that he could be wrong in his reasoning, so he must allow others the same right to live by their conclusions.

However, in the case of Matthew 19:9 the conclusion is explicitly spelled out by revelation. What about any person (“whoever”) who divorces for any cause,

other than fornication, and remarries? What is the conclusion of this matter? He “commits adultery”, if words mean anything at all. If he “commits (or is committing, a continuing or repetitive action, as the tense of the verse suggests) adultery”, then what should brethren do about it? Again the conclusion is explicitly stated by revelation. In 1 Corinthians 5, we read instructions as to what is to be done about “sexual immorality” (all agree that adultery falls into that category). Such ones are to be “judged” (v. 3, 12-13) and then “delivered ... to Satan” (v. 5) “purged out” (v. 7), “not kept company with” (v. 11), and “put away” (v. 13), by faithful brethren.

Further, the conclusion is clearly stated that the church cannot “allow (“suffer”—KJV) (one) to commit sexual immorality” nor can it allow one to teach others to do so. (See Revelation 2:20).

In view of all of this, we should not force Matthew 19:9 into Romans 14.

Our Regular Services

Sundays:

Bible Classes	9:45 A.M.
Worship	10:45 A.M.
Worship	6:00 P.M.

Wednesdays:

Bible Classes	7:30 P.M.
---------------------	-----------

Fulton Dale Church of Christ

2005 Elkwood Drive

Abortion

From page 1

demand as right. First, it is said that the fetus or prenatal child is not really a person but is only an appendage to the mother. Therefore, the mother has the "freedom of choice" to remove this fetus or glob of flesh just as she might a wart, a bunion, a diseased organ, or a tumor. According to this argument, the infant's body does not receive a human life until sometime shortly before birth or perhaps just after birth.

In James 2:14-26, the inspired writer explains that spiritual life or a right relationship with God depends upon both faith in God and obedience to God's Word. Faith needs works just as the body needs the spirit for life on earth:

Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.

Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and, not by faith only.

For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.

When faith obeys, working the will of God and not of man, faith saves.

The body with the spirit is *alive*; without the spirit the body is *dead*. Faith with works is alive but without works is dead. The

denominational doctrine in the Methodist discipline and Baptist manual that "faith only" saves before and without water baptism is wrong (Mk. 16:18). Such teaching nullifies the active, obedient nature of true faith. "Once saved, always saved" is wrong for the same reason. To say that faith is alive is to say that works are present. *To say that the body is alive is to say that the spirit is present.*

All admit that the fetus is a living body and the Word of God says that this means the spirit is *present*. The fetus is a human life and a human being who lives in the protective care of the mother's womb. To take that innocent life is murder. The abortionist's argument degrades the value of that life in order to make it *expendable*.

Some people claim the immortal spirit of man is not present until a breath is drawn after birth. They cite Genesis 2:17, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." But this is a reference to the unique circumstances of the miraculous creation of an *adult*. We had as well argue that a person does not receive his spirit and is not a true

human being *until adulthood* since Adam received his spirit as an adult. Life began for Eve with her miraculous creation from a rib, but that does not explain how a human life begins today. After the original creation of man and woman, God ordained that the life of a person begins by the uniting of the male sperm and female egg. The conception of a human life initiates the growth of a human body. This new life includes the presence of a human spirit (Jas. 2:24).

David says that his life as a human being was valued and protected by God even during the formative stages of the body "in my mother's womb" (Psa. 139:13-16). When Exodus 21:22 speaks of a pregnant woman so injured as to suffer a miscarriage or premature birth, the King James Version translates "... so that her fruit depart from her." The Hebrew text says literally, "her children come out" (see notes in New American Standard Bible and the Keil and Delitzsch commentary on *The Pentateuch*, II:134). It is not a disposable glob or growth which lives in the mother's womb, but a *child*. This living being is a human child both *before* and *after* birth.

The New Testament recognizes the same principle. After Elizabeth "conceived a son," she was greeted by Mary and "the babe leaped in her womb" (Lk. 1:41). But Mary also conceived, gave birth to a son, and laid "the babe ... in a manger" (Lk. 2:12). The same word "*babe*" is used in both passages. It is a baby *in* the womb and a baby *out* of the womb! If a baby in the womb can be declared sub-human and discarded as a wart or tumor, the same thing can be done to a baby out of the womb.

A child, a baby -- a *human body with a human spirit* -- lives

Our Next

Gospel Meeting

September 22, 23, 24

Speaker:

Max Shearer

in the protective care of his mother's womb. If he is sub-human and expendable because he cannot breathe for himself in the womb, then we may dispose of him if he needs a respirator out of the womb. A human child, *body and spirit*, lives in the mother's womb. Taking that life by abortion on demand is another name for murder.

Also, notice that the Jehovah's Witnesses, 7th Day Adventists, and Armstrong's 7th Day Church of God all claim that the spirit of man is just his breath -- no immortal inner man dwells in the body. In that case, the prenatal child is sub-human, a *body without a spirit*, and so can be disposed of as a carcass. Such religious groups cannot consistently oppose abortion because a *body without a spirit is not a human being*. If the "body" or "mass of flesh" growing in a mother's womb is not a human being, discarding it cannot be sinful any more than removing a tumor! While these groups claim to hold the line on murder and morality, their theory on the soul or spirit of man fits the abortionist argument whether they realize it or not. These false religions must either join the abortionists or else

admit that the unborn child is both body and spirit, outer man and inner man.

Does Exodus 21 Approve Abortion On Demand?

Exodus 21 :22-25 is often used to defend abortion on demand, although the passage deals only with accidental abortion. Abortionists claim the passage requires a more severe penalty for harming a pregnant woman than for harming her child who may be aborted in the course of the injury. The fetus is not given full human status, it is said. The passage reads:

If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine.

And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life.

Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,

Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe (King James Ver.)

And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a miscarriage, yet there is no further injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges decide.

But if there is any further injury, then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise (New American Standard)

If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she give birth prematurely but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined whatever the woman's husband demands and the court allows.

But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise (New International Ver.).

The claim that anything in this passage makes the prenatal child something less than a human being is pure assumption!

Exodus 21 teaches that a fine is required if the baby is born prematurely because of injury inflicted on the mother. *This fine is exacted even if the baby is unharmed and normal at birth.* This takes into account that both the mother and her child were endangered by the blow, just as people are endangered by kidnapping even though not harmed. Both the mother and the unborn infant are valued and protected by this law.

— To Be Continued Next Month



The Reflector

Published monthly by the church of Christ meeting at 2005 Elkwood Drive, Fultondale, AL 35068. All articles by the editor unless otherwise indicated.

Edward O. Bragwell, Sr.
Editor

The Reflector
3004 Brakefield Drive
Fultondale, AL 35068
USPS 606-140

Second Class Postage

PAID

Fultondale, AL
35068